

**Transcript of  
March 23, 2004  
Public Hearing**

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY

PUBLIC COMMENTS  
ON THE DRAFT PROGRAM EIR/EIS

LIBRARY GALLERIA  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2004

4:00 P.M.

REPORTED BY:

ESTHER F. SCHWARTZ  
CSR NO. 1564

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1

## 1 ATTENDEES

## 2 AUTHORITY MEMBERS:

3 JOSEPH E. PETRILLO, CHAIRMAN  
4 MARC ADELMAN  
5 ROD DIRIDON  
6 LYNN SCHENK

7 MEHDI MORSHED, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

## 8 PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS:

9 DEE DEE D'ADAMO  
10 RIFCK OSORIO  
11 LARRY MILLER  
12 DAN CURTIN  
13 STEVE COHN  
14 LEE BASEE  
15 ED THOMPSON  
16 JAY HANSEN  
17 STUART FLASHMAN  
18 BENJAMIN DURAN  
19 DARIN GALE  
20 MICHAEL KIESLING  
21 TIM CREMINS  
22 DAN MCNAMARA  
23 DAVID UNDERWOOD  
24 EDDY MOORE  
25 GENE ROBINSON  
RUSSELL REAGAN  
PAUL DORN  
BARBARA WASHBURN  
ALAN C. MILLER  
AL CHANEY  
MARC GUERPETTE  
STEVE MARTINEZ  
KEN CHAMPION  
KRISTINA SERMERSHEIM

---oOo---

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

2

1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

2 TUESDAY, MARCH 23, 2004, 4:00 P.M.

3 ---oOo---

4 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: I would like to begin. I  
5 know it is a few minutes early, but unless somebody  
6 complains I'd just as soon start, and we will use this  
7 time to set up some of the housekeeping rules.

8 This is our first hearing on the California  
9 High-Speed Authority's Environmental Impact Report for the  
10 high-speed rail transportation system for California.

11 This is a period that we give to the public to comment on  
12 the draft report prepared by our consultants. Our  
13 consultants have done what they needed to do and completed  
14 a report and did the best they can, and now it is time for  
15 us to receive all of the comments and for the public to  
16 assist us in making an environmental impact report that is  
17 perfect.

18 The process for the hearings will be to -- I have a  
19 list of speakers, and we will have public officials  
20 speaking first. We would like the speakers to have their  
21 comments limited to about three minutes, and I will remind  
22 you if you begin going substantially over that.

23 Please, when you come up, say your name and your  
24 affiliation. Your comments are being recorded so that  
25 they will be available, obviously, to us and the people

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

3

1 doing the environmental impact report. I want to  
2 encourage all of you who have complex or highly technical  
3 comments to submit them in written form so that the  
4 consultants can adequately understand your comments and  
5 then review them and respond to those comments in an  
6 effective manner. So please submit those as much as you  
7 can.

8 For those that were not here earlier, the Board  
9 agreed to extend the comment period through August because  
10 a number of jurisdictions and individuals who intended to  
11 put in highly technical comments indicated to us that they  
12 needed additional time to review what is admittedly a huge  
13 and complicated document. In addition, during this  
14 extended time, we will have two additional hearings for  
15 the purposes of having even more public testimony and also  
16 to give those, who need that additional time to review the  
17 environmental impact report and the technical documents, a  
18 chance to comment at that time.

19 So, with that, I will begin. The first speaker we  
20 have is Dee Dee D'Adamo, who is from Congressman Cardoza's  
21 office.

**PH-S001**

22 MS. D'ADAMO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and  
23 Board Members. My name is Dee Dee D'Adamo. I am a senior  
24 policy adviser to Congressman Dennis Cardoza. He has  
25 asked me to read written comments that he has prepared so

PH-S001-1

4

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 that you may have them for your record.

2 I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment to  
3 the California High-Speed Rail Authority regarding the  
4 Draft Program EIR/EIS. I concur with the Authority's  
5 conclusion that our existing transportation system does  
6 not meet California's current transportation needs, much  
7 less the demands of a growing population.

8 With growth in the State projected to increase 31  
9 percent by the year 2020 and 54 percent by the year 2035,  
10 it is crucial that we act now to meet this state's  
11 transportation infrastructure needs. High-Speed offers a  
12 common sense solution to our state's transportation  
13 congestion and air quality problems and also provides a  
14 vision for our state's infrastructure and economic future.

15 In particular, high-speed rail offers great benefits  
16 to California's Central Valley. The Central Valley has  
17 experienced the highest growth rate in the state in recent  
18 years. This trend is expected to continue well into the  
19 future. Although growth in the valley has growth economic  
20 opportunity, it has also brought with it congestion, poor  
21 air quality, impaired travel reliability and longer travel  
22 times. Additionally, the I-5 and Highway 99 corridors  
23 provide the major surface transportation link between the  
24 northern and southern parts of the state. As an apex of  
25 this state's transportation activity, it is especially

PH-S001-I  
cont

1 important for the High-Speed Rail Authority to consider  
2 the unique problems and needs of the Central Valley when  
3 evaluating the draft document.

4 The Central Valley ranks among the worst air quality  
5 regions in the nation. The San Joaquin Valley Air  
6 Pollution Unified Control District with jurisdiction over  
7 eight San Joaquin Valley counties, stretching from San  
8 Joaquin to Kern Counties, has recently applied for a bump  
9 of its extreme -- of its air quality nonattainment status,  
10 moving from severe nonattainment to extreme nonattainment.  
11 The extreme nonattainment designation is shared only with  
12 the Los Angeles air basin.

13 A high-speed rail system with links up and down the  
14 valley will help to alleviate our air quality and  
15 congestion problems. I appreciate the Authority's  
16 analysis of air quality benefits and impacts which  
17 estimate a significant decrease into criteria pollutants  
18 with the high-speed rail, and wish to underscore the  
19 importance of the Authority's consideration of air quality  
20 benefits as it evaluates this document, particularly in  
21 extreme or severe nonattainment regions.

22 The draft document concludes that development,  
23 construction, operation and maintenance of a high-speed  
24 rail will result in the creation of as many as 450,000  
25 jobs in the state. As a member of Congress representing

PH-S001-1  
cont

6

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 some of the highest unemployment areas in the nation, such  
2 as Merced County, I believe the potential this project  
3 brings for economic development in the valley is  
4 especially important. All too often the Central Valley  
5 lags behind economic development and job growth  
6 experienced in other regions of the state. I strongly  
7 urge the Authority to adopt a northern county crossing  
8 through Merced County to align with San Jose with route  
9 connections up and down the valley. This option will best  
10 connect the valley with other major urban areas of the  
11 state and also will bring better economic development  
12 opportunities to the valley. Additionally, I  
13 strongly urge the Authority to incorporate the selection  
14 of a main repair and maintenance facility in Merced County  
15 at the Castle Airport Aviation and Development Center,  
16 also known as the former over Castle Air Force Base.

PH-S001-1  
cont

17 The draft document outlines the high-speed rail  
18 system needs for a main repair and maintenance facility.  
19 The Castle Airport is an ideal location for a repair and  
20 maintenance facility. It meets the outlined criteria and  
21 carries with it the added benefits of public ownership,  
22 available land and opportunities to connect with other  
23 rail and air services.

PH-S001-2

24 I commend the Authority Board Members and staff for  
25 their diligent work on this document. I recognize there

PH-S001-3

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

7

1 is much work to be done on the document and that our  
2 state's financial crisis may delay consideration of the  
3 bond by the voters. This should not let us lose sight of  
4 the vision and of our goal and will hopefully provide this  
5 Board with the opportunity to further improve the  
6 proposal.

PH-S001-4

7 I appreciate the opportunity to provide my comments  
8 and look forward to working with the Authority on this  
9 project.

10 Thank you very much, and I have written comments  
11 that I will submit to your clerk along with a letter that  
12 the Congressman sent to the Chairman on October 17th for  
13 the benefit of the other Board Members.

14 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

15 The next speaker is Rick Osorio, Councilmember of  
16 Merced.

**PH-S002**

17 MR. OSORIO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and  
18 Board Members. As I stand before you, I want to thank you  
19 for giving us the opportunity to speak to you regarding  
20 the high-speed rail and current EIR/EIS proposal. I would  
21 like to say at this time that we of the City of Merced are  
22 in full support of not only the high-speed rail, but also  
23 we think you are on the right track -- I know it's pun --  
24 but on the right track looking at the Diablo alignment in  
25 through Merced, which would also be capable of handling

PH-S002-1

PH-S002-2



1 the hub for maintenance facility in Castle -- the former  
2 Castle Air Force Base.

PH-S002-2  
cont

3 More than that, I believe that the high-speed rail  
4 is -- at this time if you just look at what is happening  
5 at the state, it would be a time and a cost-effective way  
6 of moving forward with the transportation needs of not  
7 only the Central Valley but the whole state. We need no  
8 get away from having -- just building more freeways. We  
9 can't even get land for more freeways. We have projects  
10 that are on the boards that have been on there for 20  
11 years. If we wait 20 more years those projects aren't go  
12 to be done anyway, so we should be spending our time like  
13 you are, working on the high-speed rail.

14 I think that would solve a lot of problems. It  
15 would solve pollution problems. It would solve  
16 unemployment problems for an area that is highly -- at 18  
17 percent unemployment. It is the central part of the state  
18 where all cities could connect, and I think it would be a  
19 system that is efficient by building -- instead of  
20 building 3,000 more traffic lanes and highways. Not only  
21 that, the cost of land acquisition is getting high; you  
22 can't buy any more land to make it worthwhile.

PH-S002-3

23 The access of -- the travel and access is for  
24 longer distance intercity travel, and the high-speed train  
25 would derive door-to-door service, and Californians would

1 finally have a way to get out of their cars and get into  
2 trains. I know right now that Amtrak is not sufficient  
3 for our needs right now. If we have to come here to  
4 Sacramento, we have to leave early in the morning, and  
5 then leave late at night. It works for Sacramento because  
6 we have to spend our money hear for lunch and dinner, et  
7 cetera. That is not what we really talk about.

8 It takes a -- for businesses it takes a lot of time  
9 out of their busy day. If I want to go to a conference in  
10 San Diego, I have to take a whole day off and ride the  
11 train to get down there. With this new system it would be  
12 more efficient. It would work for economic reasons as  
13 well, not to mention the air pollution that's out there.

14 We can continue to blame anybody we want for the air  
15 pollution, but the pollution is there. We are not going  
16 to go fix it with just fuel efficient cars. The trucking  
17 industry has a lot of fuel contaminants also, so it is  
18 difficult for them because they still have to do business.  
19 The high-speed rail is the only answer.

20 The other thing is the benefits to the City of  
21 Merced, not only the community of Merced, but all of the  
22 Central Valley would have more employment, better access  
23 to the other cities. We have a U.C. Merced. We were very  
24 persistent in bringing that to our city. That is 25,000  
25 students that need a ride home at the end of the day. Not

PH-S002-3  
cont

10

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 all of them will be from the Central Valley. Most like to  
2 go to other areas to go to school. One only has to look  
3 at the Central Coast train that goes down through Santa  
4 Barbara on Fridays and Sunday nights and see how many  
5 students ride the train back to the universities that they  
6 go to. There is another reason to have that there. And  
7 if there is a way of getting at least a lot of it done  
8 within the next 20 years, that would be perfect for our  
9 students when we are full out at U.C. Merced.

10 The other thing that I want to say is that I want to  
11 thank you for your persistence in continuing the vision of  
12 bringing this to the state of California. Believe me,  
13 everyone in California will thank you, and we look forward  
14 to working with you to make this happen.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

17 I would like to acknowledge a representative of  
18 Senator Boxer's office, Stacey Lybeck, who is in the  
19 audience joining us. The Senator has been a long time  
20 supporter of high-speed rail, and we thank her very much  
21 for that.

22 The next person who has asked to speak is Larry  
23 Miller of the San Joaquin Rail Committee.

**PH-S003** 24

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, Members, thank you  
25 for the opportunity to be here. I will try to be as

PH-S002-3  
cont

PH-S003-1

1 mercifully brief as possible and confine my remarks to the  
2 EIR/EIS document. I will come to you in a future meeting  
3 with some more detailed remarks about how Amtrak and the  
4 San Joaquin service could be more fully incorporated, I  
5 think, into your plan. They will be constructed remarks.

6 But what I want to confine myself here to now is a  
7 small aspect of your plan which regards the no-build  
8 alternative. My remarks are on paper. They are for your  
9 future reference. But in essence what I would like to  
10 suggest is your plan presupposes that the limit on

11 city-to-city travel in California is limited by  
12 infrastructure. In other words, you can't build more  
13 airports and you can't really expand the airports we have.  
14 That is a very valid argument, and I salute you for  
15 realizing this.

16 However, a still greater impediment, and this goes  
17 to the no-build alternative, is the fact that the airline  
18 industry itself has changed dramatically, even radically  
19 to the point where the airline industry is now focused on  
20 regional flying, not point-to-point flying. They fly to  
21 fortress hubs. In Fresno, for example, and I am very well  
22 acquainted within this intimately you might say because my  
23 wife markets the Fresno airport to the airline industries.  
24 We now have regional access to Denver, Salt Lake, Phoenix,  
25 Portland, Seattle, Dallas, et cetera. But what we don't

PH-S003-1  
cont

1 have are the flights that we used to have, to Los Angeles  
2 and San Francisco, San Diego, et cetera. Those flights  
3 are disappearing. It is not a function of Fresno or the  
4 infrastructure of the airport. It is not a function of  
5 the infrastructure, the limited infrastructure in Los  
6 Angeles or San Francisco. But rather it is a more  
7 fundamental shift in the industry itself, and they have  
8 repositioned their flights and their fleets in such a way  
9 that they couldn't and wouldn't fly those routes even if  
10 you built the airports.

11 So in your no-buildout alternative, when you  
12 presuppose if we build it they would come, they ain't  
13 going to come. They've gotten away it. It's not  
14 cost-effective for them. So what I am suggesting is that  
15 you look at your no-build alternative in such a way as to  
16 consider that. It is likely, and here I am throwing a  
17 number out, but I suspect that your analysis is  
18 underdimensioned by a factor of about two, which, when you  
19 reconsider and rework it, would make for a still stronger  
20 argument in favor of high-speed rail.

21 With that I conclude my remarks.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. That  
24 is a very good point. I am sure our consultants will take  
25 it into account.

PH-S003-1  
cont

**PH-S004**

1 Dan Curtin.

2 MR. CURTIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

3 My name is Dan Curtin. I am the Director of the  
4 California Conference of Carpenters. I am happy for the  
5 opportunity to make our comments, which will be very  
6 simple, very brief.

PH-S004-1

7 We want to encourage you to do everything possible  
8 to keep the development, the planning and everything that  
9 goes along with the high-speed rail program on track as  
10 much as possible. I realize there is tremendous financial  
11 pressures facing the state and you as well. On the face  
12 of it, in terms of environmental concerns, if this project  
13 goes forward and handles a large portion of our intercity  
14 traffic, I think it is a dah, a no-brainer regarding the  
15 environment. It's been a long time coming. We see what  
16 high-speed rail can do in places like Europe. Used to be  
17 considered something different because it was a more  
18 compact community. But when you have basically an urban  
19 sprawl from San Diego all the way to Ventura and Santa  
20 Barbara and a short hop, so to speak, to San Francisco and  
21 you bring in the Central Valley and Sacramento, it no  
22 longer looks like a vast expanse between cities. And this  
23 will help the traffic that is just going to continue and  
24 grow. There is only so many lanes of highway that can be  
25 built, even if we can build them, and as you just heard

14

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 about the airports, high-speed rail is technology and the  
2 jobs it will bring, not just the construction jobs, but  
3 the technological jobs and the connection of cities and  
4 the connection of universities and so on and so forth,  
5 strongly encourage you to do everything possible to keep  
6 moving forward.

PH-S004-1  
cont

7 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.  
8 The next speaker is Steve Cohn, Councilmember here  
9 in Sacramento.

**PH-S005**

10 MR. COHN: Good afternoon, Members of the  
11 Commission, and welcome to the City of Sacramento and our  
12 lovely Library Galleria building. A few redevelopment  
13 dollars went into this, but an excellent building.

14 I am here really for two reasons. I am, in addition  
15 to being on the City Council, a member of our Regional  
16 Transit Board and also past chair and member of the  
17 Capitol Corridor Regional Rail. But I am here today on  
18 behalf specifically of the City of Sacramento.

PH-S005-5

19 You probably are aware that we are making plans for  
20 an intermodal station downtown, and the EIR examines two  
21 options or alternatives for a station here in the City of  
22 Sacramento, and one is out on Power Inn and the other one  
23 is downtown at our intermodal center, and that is really  
24 what we want you to focus your attention in terms of a  
25 preferred alternative. Because one of the key elements of

15

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 the high-speed rail is the revitalization of cities, in  
2 particularly the inner cores. That is one of the  
3 advantages of high-speed rail over air travel. It is hard  
4 to put an airport, although San Diego has managed to do  
5 it. But I am not sure that is a model for future  
6 airports, but it is hard to fit an airport downtown, but a  
7 high-speed rail station can and usually does go downtown.

8 We really would like you to keep that as our  
9 preferred alternative for the City of Sacramento. We have  
10 just taken action recently to further along that concept,  
11 and we are using that EIR from your staff to help plan the  
12 expansion of our intermodal facility. It is a facility  
13 that we think the whole state will be proud of and it is  
14 something that we would like to see high-speed rail  
15 connect to.

16 And that brings me to my second point which is we do  
17 support high-speed rail. We understand there a lot of  
18 challenges ahead. But we really want that to connect into  
19 downtown and we want to be sure that Sacramento is a part  
20 of that high-speed rail system.

21 If there are any questions, I would be happy to  
22 answer those for you. But that is really the thrust of my  
23 comments. The intermodal details, so to speak, will be  
24 coming out over the next year or two as we prepare, get  
25 into the design phase. Right now we are still in the

PH-S005-1  
cont



1 planning stages. You may have heard we are actually going  
2 to move the station approximately 3- to 400 feet to be  
3 closer to where the tracks are, and we have checked on  
4 that and high-speed rail was one of the issues we looked  
5 at when we looked at how to design our station. The same  
6 firm that is designing the new facility in San Francisco  
7 is designing our station as well.

PH-S005-1  
cont

8 So if there are no questions, I will thank you very  
9 much and wish you a wonderful time in the City of  
10 Sacramento.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. That  
13 downtown station is an exciting project.

14 MR. COHN: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Anybody from San Diego  
16 want to --

17 MEMBER SCHENK: I like downtowns.

18 MR. COHN: And I am a U.S.D. grad, too.

19 MEMBER SCHENK: Anniversary is coming up.

20 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: That's right, next month.

21 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Our next speaker is Marc  
22 Garcia.

**PH-S006** 3

MR. GARCIA: Chairman Petrillo and Board  
24 Members, good afternoon. My name is Marc Garcia. I am  
25 the attorney for and proud member of the Merced County

PH-S0061

17

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 High-Speed Rail Committee.

2 I come to you today as the father of two young boys,  
3 as a small businessman and as advocate for the San  
4 Jose-Merced route or Diablo route. As a father of two  
5 young boys, one of whom has asthma, air quality is a very  
6 important issue and one that is dear to me. High-speed  
7 rail offers the first legitimate solution to that problem,  
8 and I encourage the Commission to seek the  
9 Diablo-Merced-San Jose route as the preferred route  
10 through the Central Valley.

11 The thought of my family traveling from the corn  
12 fields of Merced to the beaches of Southern California is  
13 an exciting opportunity. As an avid baseball, taking my  
14 children to Pac Bell Park in just under an hour is also a  
15 super opportunity.

16 As a small businessman being in Merced County in the  
17 last ten years has opened my eyes. It has brought me to  
18 the point where 17 percent of unemployment rate is no  
19 longer tolerable. When the Castle Air Force Base closed  
20 in 1993, it was devastating to our community. And the  
21 opportunity for that center to become one that could be  
22 potentially a hub and maintenance facility for the  
23 California High-Speed Rail is something that is too good  
24 for not only our community, but for the State of  
25 California to pass up. This is why I am advocating the

PH-S006-1  
cont

18

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 San Jose-Merced route. It is also why I am coming to you  
2 today, shutting down my office, and advocating for this  
3 specific route to come through the Central Valley.

4 It is time for California to embrace this tremendous  
5 endeavor. It is time for the Central Valley to be  
6 interlinked with the Bay Area and Southern California, and  
7 it is time for Merced and the Central Valley to become  
8 that route through which we can link those two  
9 metropolitan areas.

10 Again, thank you for the opportunity to address you  
11 today. Good luck.

12 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. As  
13 an attorney also that works on time and materials, I can  
14 understand this sacrifice to come here today.

15 Next is Elaine Trevino.

**PH-S007** 16 MS. TREVINO: Are you tired of Merced yet? One  
17 more. I am here representing the Chancellor, Carol  
18 Tomlinson-Keasey, from the University of California,  
19 Merced. She asked me to read these written comments.

20 Dear Chairman and Members of the Board, I am pleased  
21 to submit this letter of support for the Draft Program  
22 EIR/EIS and the analysis that identified high-speed trains  
23 as the preferred system alternative to address future  
24 transit needs in California. The University of California  
25 Merced will open in fall 2005 as the tenth campus of the

PH-S006-I  
cont

PH-S007-1

1 University of California and the only research university  
2 located in the Central Valley. The campus will grow to an  
3 ultimate size of 25,000 students over the next three  
4 decades. High-speed trains will provide a greatly  
5 enhanced access to the campus for students, factual,  
6 staff, colleagues from other universities and other  
7 visitors.

PH-S007-1  
cont

8 In particular high-speed rail service would permit  
9 students from Bakersfield to Stockton to commute from  
10 their homes to U.C. Merced, an option that would result in  
11 significant cost savings and allow greater access to U.C.  
12 education for students not living in the proximity of the  
13 campus.

14 In addition, the availability of high-speed rail  
15 service for U.S. Merced students will create ridership and  
16 a commute pattern that would carry on to post collegiate  
17 life. High-speed rail service also would contribute  
18 significantly to overall economic growth and job creation  
19 in the Central Valley.

20 In evaluating the environmental considerations  
21 identified in the Draft Program EIR/EIS cost projections  
22 for the various routes and ridership potential, the U.C.  
23 Merced campus supports the Diablo route with a hub and  
24 route stop at Castle Aviation and Development Center,  
25 formerly known as Castle Air Force Base. In addition,

PH-S007-2

1 U.C. Merced supports location of a maintenance facility at  
2 the Castle site.

PH-S007-3

3 Thank you very much for your hard work and your  
4 consideration of these comments.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much, and  
7 we are not tired of Merced yet, and, in fact, I understand  
8 most of us are moving there.

9 Lee Basee.

**PH-S008**

10 DR. BASEE: Good afternoon, Chairman Petrillo.  
11 Good afternoon, Authority Board Members. My name is Dr.  
12 Lee Basee. I am a local orthodontist in Merced and a  
13 high-speed rail enthusiast.

14 As chairman of our Merced County High-Speed Rail  
15 Committee, I represent a diverse spectrum background of  
16 professionals and other community leaders. I would like  
17 to thank the California High-Speed Rail Authority and  
18 staff for all their hard work in making high-speed rail a  
19 reality in California and for their outreach efforts to  
20 date, despite having a small budget to do so.

PH-S008-1

21 I believe that the Merced County High-Speed Rail  
22 Committee is in a unique position to provide productive  
23 input to policy discussions on high-speed rail. As  
24 citizens of Merced County community we are residents,  
25 businessmen and women, parents and advocates and voters

PH-S008-2

1 and on the front lines of advocating for a critical  
2 infrastructure and community service for ourselves and for  
3 our children. Our group was formed for the sole purpose  
4 of advocating the importance of high-speed rail, not only  
5 for Merced County, but for the entire Central Valley.

PH-S008-2  
cont

6 The Central Valley unfortunately continues to be  
7 number one on the list of things that are undesirable. We  
8 lead the nation in poverty levels, unemployment and high  
9 teen pregnancies. As a community leader, we realize that  
10 doing nothing will not change the statues on this list.  
11 We want to be number one the list for something that is  
12 good, for something that is productive, for something that  
13 is good for the environment. And that would be bringing  
14 high-speed to our community.

15 The mission of our committee is to advocate for  
16 California's high-speed rail system on the Diablo range as  
17 the alternative route, as the preferred stop by 2004.

18 Additionally, we are advocating for the Castle Aviation  
19 and Development Center as a train stop and as a  
20 maintenance facility site for the system. After reading  
21 the EIR/EIS it is clear to our committee that the current  
22 transportation systems cannot accommodate our projected  
23 state population growth and will be challenged in doing so  
24 with the needed expansions.

PH-S008-3

PH-S008-4

25 The cost analysis for expansions versus the cost of

PH-S008-4  
cont

1 constructing a high-speed rail system alone shows the  
2 value of this proposed system. Coming from a community  
3 where most high school students have never traveled to  
4 Yosemite National Park upon graduation nor have they  
5 traveled beyond a hundred mile radius of where they  
6 reside, I can tell you that a train system will provide  
7 access for educational opportunities, social and cultural  
8 events, sports and athletic competitions for our youth in  
9 a quick travel time and in a safe reliable manner.

10 Our community has double-digit unemployment rate  
11 which is chronic. Many unemployed individuals do not have  
12 cars or are limited to their travel time. A high-speed  
13 train will provide access to higher paying jobs from 60 to  
14 120 mile radius and will connect large urban economies and  
15 business centers to the Central Valley. Since many  
16 individuals that live in the Merced community are already  
17 communicating to other cities for employment, this  
18 high-speed system can positively contribute to reducing  
19 the number of vehicles on the highway through an  
20 integrated transportation system.

21 As a doctor, I am very concerned about the air  
22 quality of the Central Valley. I am seeing more and more  
23 children with asthma and upper respiratory problems.  
24 After reading the EIR/EIS, our committee believes that  
25 high-speed rail is better for the environment than

23

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 expanding highways and airports, since most alignments are  
2 within or adjacent to existing railway or highway  
3 right-of-ways.

PH-S008-4  
cont

4 I concur with the Authority's assessment that the  
5 high-speed train system will likely reduce air pollutant  
6 emissions from vehicles and provide a system that can  
7 reduce the pollutant emissions that come with population  
8 growth. This plan transportation infrastructure solution  
9 can help improve the Central Valley's air quality and  
10 promote transit oriented growth to meet future population  
11 demands. The Merced community will be able to take  
12 advantage of the benefits from a high-speed rail system,  
13 and the students of U.C. Merced will have regional access  
14 and transportation to them.

15 Our committee believes that the process of  
16 developing a system will provide opportunities to  
17 encourage local growth strategies around Highway 99, which  
18 will help preserve agricultural land in the long term  
19 since agriculture is still our number one economic --

20 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: You are running out of  
21 time.

22 DR. BASEE: I'm sorry.

23 In conclusion, I can assure you that the Merced  
24 County High-Speed Rail Committee will continue to advocate  
25 for a high-speed rail to our region, and we will continue

PH-S008-4  
cont



1 to be strong supporters of the high-speed rail.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

4 Mr. Ed Thompson.

**PH-S009**

5 MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,

6 Members of the Authority. I am Ed Thompson, California

7 Director of the American Farmland Trust. I will be

8 submitting comments later on for the record.

9 American Farmland Trust is a 24-year old national

10 conservation organization dedicated to keeping our

11 nation's best farmland in agricultural use and helping

12 assure that it's farm sustainable. We opened our first

13 office here in California in 1983. I myself have played a

14 role in operations here for nearly that long.

15 The proposed high-speed rail system would be one of

16 the best things ever to happen in California or one of the

17 worst. It can harness tremendous civic enthusiasm to

18 build diverse, efficient, livable communities in the midst

19 of a living landscape of sustainable agriculture and a

20 healthy environment. But without a comparable effort to

21 harness the development that it will certainly attract, to

22 prevent it from getting out of control, the system could

23 cause a train wreck for agriculture, for the environment

24 and for every Californian who will end up paying the tab

25 for sprawl.

PH-S008-4  
cont

PH-S009-1

25

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

PH-S009-1  
cont

1           The American Farmland Trust is particularly  
2   concerned about the Central Valley, which we've ranked as  
3   the most productive and most threatened agricultural  
4   region in the United States. The EIR concludes that  
5   within the time frame it analyzed the growth in the valley  
6   that nearly a half million acres of farmland would be  
7   developed. But it almost certainly underestimates the  
8   impact of the rail system on the valley and its farmland.  
9   For one, it concludes that the project will have little  
10   affect on growth, even though your own literature boasts  
11   that this will create a new California gold rush. And the  
12   testimony here today certainly confirms that people are  
13   expecting a lot of growth in the valley. It seems to  
14   assume that the valley will grow more like the Bay Area  
15   than like the valley has to date, consuming far less  
16   farmland for new residents. But the EIR offers no  
17   convincing evidence of how this dramatic transformation is  
18   going to take place.

19           Finally, the EIR appears to ignore the substantial  
20   amount of development, as much as 20 percent, that is  
21   occurring on ranchettes outside the valley's urban areas,  
22   which this project could exacerbate. A more realistic  
23   examination of the impact of the high-speed rail system on  
24   Central Valley farmland would probably reveal that it has  
25   more than doubled what the EIR projects. That is what

26

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 some researchers at U.C. Berkeley that AFT asked a number  
2 of years ago to look at this very question concluded.

PH-S009-1  
cont

3 If that is the case, within a generation the Central  
4 Valley could start to resemble the L.A. basin. If that  
5 seems far-fetched, consider when President Kennedy took  
6 office, Los Angeles was still the number one agricultural  
7 county in this country.

8 The main issue, though, isn't necessarily whether  
9 the EIR is wrong. It is really whether the local  
10 governments and state agencies will step up their efforts  
11 to plan for and manage growth in the Central Valley and  
12 elsewhere in California. There are already laws on the  
13 books to enable them to do this. A good example passed  
14 just last session here in Sacramento. It was AB 857,  
15 which is a blueprint for smarter growth in this state. It  
16 calls for better use of vacant, urban land and more  
17 efficient development on the edges of cities and better  
18 protection for farmland and for open space.

19 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: You are running over our  
20 time.

21 MR. THOMPSON: I will, Mr. Chairman.

22 We believe that one of the alternatives that the  
23 Authority and its consultants should look at to link this  
24 law and other smart growth policies to the rapid rail  
25 system. If we marry the high-speed rail system with smart

PH-S009-1  
cont

27

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 growth and only if we do so, we can build a better  
2 California where roads are less congested and our skies  
3 are less crowded, our environment is cleaner and our  
4 housing is more affordable and our agriculture can still  
5 be counted on to feed the nation and the world.

PH-S009-1  
cont

6 Thanks for your attention.

7 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

8 My recollection of the EIR, it indicated that  
9 compared to a road system carrying the same number of  
10 people, there would be less sprawl in the Central Valley  
11 from the high-speed rail. So I would be interested in  
12 getting your comments on specifically that part of the  
13 analysis.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Will do, Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Jay Hansen, State Building  
16 Construction Trades Council.

**PH-S010**

17 MR. HANSEN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,  
18 Board Members. I am Jay Hansen with the State Building  
19 Trades Council. We represent about 400,000 unionized  
20 construction workers in California.

PH-S010-1

21 The brothers and sisters of the building trades know  
22 that when it comes to building high-speed trains and the  
23 lines, it's not a matter of if, but a matter of when. We  
24 endorse the plans laid out in the Draft Environmental  
25 Impact Report. As builders in California we pay attention

PH-S010-1  
cont

1 to the issue of transportation in the state, and we can  
2 back up the claim that transportation supply in California  
3 does not meet demand.

4 We support the conclusion that our transportation  
5 system should meet the demands of our growing population.  
6 We support the conclusion that a system of high-speed rail  
7 covering over 700 miles across the state will go a long  
8 ways towards meeting our future transportation needs. The  
9 EIR report found that this system will give us one-half  
10 million more jobs for California, a two-to-one return on  
11 investments to build the system and give our economy a  
12 kick start. It is an investment in an infrastructure that  
13 will truly meet the needs of future generations.

14 We appreciate the fact that once operating taxpayers  
15 won't be asked for additional money to run the system.  
16 And because high-speed trains are inexpensive, safe and a  
17 reliable mode of travel, we believe this will go a long  
18 ways towards meeting our current future demands.  
19 High-speed trains will relieve traffic congestion and  
20 create jobs, and I am here to say that we strongly support  
21 California's proposed system of high-speed trains as  
22 outlined in this draft report.

23 I appreciate your time.

24 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

25 Stuart Flashman.

29

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

**PH-S011**

1 MR. FLASHMAN: Good afternoon, I am Stuart  
2 Flashman. I am an attorney representing the California  
3 Rail Foundation and Train Riders Association of  
4 California. We will be submitting some more detailed  
5 written comments, but I did want to take this opportunity  
6 to give you our first read on the documents we have seen  
7 so far. As you are aware we have submitted a public  
8 records request and have not yet received all the  
9 documents we requested, so we can't give a fully  
10 comprehensive comment as of yet until we have seen those  
11 documents.

12 TRAC and the California Rail Foundation generally  
13 support implementation of a high-speed rail project  
14 connecting the Bay Area with Los Angeles. We are very  
15 concerned about the current draft EIR. We feel the EIR is  
16 seriously flawed and needs to have some extensive work  
17 done on it before it will be an adequate document to guide  
18 this agency's decisions.

19 In particular, we are very concerned about the  
20 document's failure to include Altamont alignment. We feel  
21 the document's design in rejecting that alignment for  
22 consideration was flawed. First off, the document asserts  
23 that it is infeasible to split trains between those going  
24 to San Jose and those going to San Francisco and those  
25 going to Oakland. And consequently in instead of

PH-S011-1

30

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 splitting trains, it uses separate trains for each of  
2 those three destinations, thereby reducing the number of  
3 trains that go to each destination.

PH-S011-1  
cont

4 Train splitting is very feasible and very  
5 practicable and is being done routinely in Europe and  
6 Japan and other places that have high-speed rail systems.  
7 There is no good reason for this EIR to reject train  
8 splitting and to consequently reduce the ridership. If  
9 the ridership was realistically calculated, it would show  
10 the Altamont ridership would be significantly greater than  
11 the ridership that is shown for Pacheco.

12 Furthermore, the EIR does not give a proper  
13 calculation of the ridership from San Francisco to  
14 Sacramento. That is a very significant route. If the  
15 Altamont route is chosen, there will be significant  
16 ridership. IF the Pacheco route is chose, that ridership  
17 will be virtually zero. There is no attraction for  
18 ridership -- for a train ride from San Francisco to  
19 Sacramento that takes almost two hours. You can do almost  
20 that well by automobile. It just won't work, and there is  
21 no reason for their being any ridership if it goes the  
22 Pacheco route.

23 Also, in terms of the proposal that there needs to  
24 be a new Dumbarton rail bridge, as the Authority I am sure  
25 is quite aware, there is going to be a rehabilitation of

1 the existing Dumbarton rail bridge. There is no reason  
2 why that rehabilitation could not include making that  
3 bridge usable for high-speed rail, and that alternative  
4 should have been considered.

PH-S011-1

5 Beyond that, I want to just briefly mention two  
6 points. One is that, as mentioned by the representative  
7 from the American Farmland Trust, the EIR just grossly  
8 underestimates the growth inducing impacts of this  
9 project, particularly in the Central Valley. There is a  
10 reason why all these people are here from Merced asking  
11 the high-speed rail go through Merced, because it is going  
12 to give them growth. It is not to say that that growth is  
13 bad, but it needs to be acknowledged. Impacts need to be  
14 considered and there needs to be appropriate mitigation  
15 such as, for example, linking the land use to the  
16 transportation.

17 Finally, the EIR essentially defers consideration of  
18 many of the environmental impacts to the project level  
19 EIRs. It does not identify ways in which one can ensure  
20 this level of programmatic EIR that the impacts will be  
21 mitigated. It simply says we will put it off to project  
22 level. That is improper. You can -- you don't have to go  
23 through the detail, but you do have to provide some  
24 assurance that those impacts will be mitigated, and the  
25 EIR doesn't do that.

PH-S011-2



1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

3 Next is Benjamin Duran.

**PH-S012**<sup>4</sup>

MR. DURAN: Good afternoon, Chairman Petrillo,  
5 and the rest of the Members of the Board. I am here in a  
6 couple of capacities. I am here as President of Merced  
7 Community College District and also as President of the  
8 Merced County Hispanic Network. Additionally, I am also a  
9 member of the Merced County High-Speed Rail Committee.

PH-S012-1

10 I want to take an opportunity to talk to you as a  
11 community college president, I am encouraged by the  
12 opportunities that the presence of a high-speed rail  
13 system in the Central Valley would mean to my students.  
14 You have heard today about the University of California  
15 coming to Merced and the benefits from that to the  
16 university, the high-speed rail for the university.  
17 However, Merced College and a number of other community  
18 colleges sit in the Central Valley and produce many  
19 students. One of the problems with community college  
20 students in the Central Valley oftentimes is that when  
21 they transfer to urban areas, to other parts of the state,  
22 to take their education, we don't get them back. We lose  
23 the best and brightest of our talents sometimes. And in  
24 the Central Valley, as you have heard, it is essential for  
25 us to have those young people come back home and make our

1 communities stronger.

2 A high-speed Rail system through the Central Valley  
3 would provide an opportunity for these students to attend  
4 community colleges locally. It would allow them to  
5 literally choose to attend almost any university in the  
6 state and still live at home if they chose to do so. When  
7 they graduated from university, to assist, to continue to  
8 assist at home. They could literally live in the Central  
9 Valley and still avail themselves of the professional  
10 opportunities that are provided throughout the State of  
11 California.

12 As a result, for my students the high-speed rail  
13 promises opportunities to this day that have never been  
14 dreamt of. You've also heard Merced County and its  
15 neighboring counties historically suffer from double-digit  
16 unemployment. The economic development implications  
17 suggested by the successful completion of high-speed rail  
18 project offers much hope to the residents of Merced County  
19 and the Central Valley. The potential job markets in  
20 other parts of the state that would be open to our  
21 residents, coupled with the opportunities locally that  
22 result from the development of the system, have great  
23 potential for this historically underutilized workforce.

24 I can see people who currently have no place to work  
25 literally getting on the train and going 30 minutes into

PH-S012-1  
cont

1 the Bay Area and working there and then coming home to  
2 their families. We have people who currently commute to  
3 the Bay Area from Merced County, and the quality of life  
4 for them is something that we have to consider. We they  
5 have children in their schools, truly, if you jump in a  
6 car and you drive two or three hours to go to the Bay Area  
7 to go to work, and then you come home, you're bone tired.  
8 You don't participate in your children's schooling. You  
9 don't participate in your community. The High-Speed Rail  
10 Authority has an opportunity to provide quality of life  
11 improvement for our residents that, again, up to this  
12 point could never been considered.

PH-S012-1  
cont

13 It is for these and other reasons that I support the  
14 Board's pursuit of project. Upon evaluation of the  
15 environmental considerations and other projections in the  
16 Draft EIR/EIS project, I want to state that I am in favor  
17 of the Merced to San Jose route, with the route stop in  
18 Merced at Castle Aviation and Development Center in Merced  
19 County. Further, I am in support of the development and  
20 construction of a maintenance facility at the same site  
21 which currently provides --

PH-S012-2

PH-S012-3

PH-S012-4

22 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Mr. Duran, excuse me,  
23 you're running over.

24 MR. DURAN: -- which currently provides for the  
25 acreage and infrastructure necessary for such a facility.

PH-S012-4  
cont

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much for

3 your comments. If you have written --

4 Mr. Tim Cremins. Tim Cremins.

5 Darin Gale.

**PH-S013** 6 MR. GALE: Thank you, Chairman, Board Members.

7 My name is Darin Gale. I work for the Sacramento  
8 Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. The Sacramento  
9 Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce represents the six local  
10 counties around this area, both Sutter, Yuba, El Dorado,  
11 Placer, Sacramento and Yolo Counties. I staff the  
12 Transportation and Air Quality Committee. In that  
13 committee we did hear a presentation from Chris, and after  
14 the presentation our committee did take a position to  
15 support in concept high-speed rail. Our transportation  
16 team is inside a nonattainment air quality district. We  
17 see this as being a vital alternative to both rail -- to  
18 both automobile and air traffic. We see it being a great  
19 opportunity to connect the cities throughout our state,  
20 and we look forward to hopefully one day having an  
21 intermodal station. Hopefully it will be built soon. We  
22 are on the process of receiving the federal appropriations  
23 to build it. We hope that it will connect our rail, Light  
24 Rail and one day the high-speed rail.

25 So we are encouraged. We definitely do support in

PH-S013-1

1 concept high-speed rail and hope there will be a stop here  
2 in Sacramento soon.

PH-S013-2

3 Thanks.

4 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: To call again, Mr. Tim  
5 Cremins. Is he here?

6 Michael Kie- --

**PH-S014**

7 MR. KIESLING: Thank you. Michael Kiesling  
8 from San Mateo, representing myself. It is nice to see a  
9 lot of Board Members here. A lot of times it seems in  
10 these hearings somebody draws the short straw, and you  
11 have one board member and everybody else sort of wanders  
12 off. Congratulations for sitting around on this.

PH-S014-1

13 When I leave here this evening to head back to San  
14 Francisco, today it will take about an hour and 45  
15 minutes, an hour and 50 minutes back into Oakland. Amtrak  
16 is planning to speed that up with the high-speed system  
17 which you are looking at it. In 20 years hopefully we  
18 will have something built.

19 One of the alternatives, though, Pacheco, I ride all  
20 the way down to Chowchilla and then get back up into  
21 Oakland. It would be roughly about the same amount of  
22 time. Of course, it would be going very fast, sort of  
23 unreasonably fast. In one of your documents it says you  
24 would be running to achieve a schedule an hour and 40 from  
25 here to Oakland nonstop. You would have to average 300

37

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 kilometers per hour, which is almost as fast as the train  
2 goes the entire way between here and Sacramento  
3 [verbatim].

4 There are -- the people from Merced have a very  
5 interesting point that they make when they talk about the  
6 maintenance facility, the heavy maintenance facility for  
7 the trains. One of the problems with the information  
8 getting out here is in your documents you two different  
9 kinds of facilities. You have light storage. You have  
10 storage and light maintenance, and you have heavy  
11 maintenance. Everybody should know that heavy maintenance  
12 isn't the same as the light storage and maintenance.  
13 That's where they pump the toilets and store the trains  
14 between when they are running out of the stations. That  
15 is currently in your EIR, which is suggested for either  
16 Los Banos and Merced.

17 The heavy maintenance, where they fix the trains and  
18 there are good jobs where you work on heavy machines and  
  
19 change the wheels and all that is planned for two  
20 locations in Los Angeles or one in Bakersfield.

21 The train storage issue is also interesting.  
22 California needed high-speed rail ten years ago. I've  
23 traveled around a lot. I like this; this is my hobby.  
24 This is what I do. So much fun stuff doing the high-speed  
25 stuff. A unique feature you have, though, is here you are

PH-S014-2

1 planning to take empty trains from either San Francisco or  
2 San Jose or Oakland and run them all the way back out to  
3 Central Valley to pump their tanks and store them until  
4 they are ready to run out and run them back up to San  
5 Francisco. In your EIR it says, in your Draft EIR you say  
6 specifically these need to be within five minutes of the  
7 end-of-the-line station and it then says but our choice is  
8 to 200 to 300 kilometers away in the Central Valley. That  
9 doesn't make sense.

PH-S014-2  
cont

10 Another little thing you come into that is a slight  
11 oversight, nowhere in your document, as far as I can tell,  
12 do you mention the San Joaquin Valley National Cemetery.  
13 The Pacheco alignment either runs right through it, not  
14 the grade stop, but across the property or right past the  
15 cemetery. People have done word searches for cemetery.  
16 You turn up Cemetery once. The quality of your maps are a  
17 little bit tough, but relative to the different maps there  
18 are, you are either right next to the Cemetery or running  
19 through the Cemetery. You need to look that up before it  
20 goes to final comment.

PH-S014-3

21 And finally, you all obviously know that -- I will  
22 wave the flag that says the EIR isn't good until Altamont  
23 is back fully considered as a full alternative. And just  
24 one little nugget that comes out of your Appendix 2H, one  
25 of the issues is wetlands. In your tables you have from

PH-S014-4

1 the discarded Altamont alignment the number of acres of  
2 wetlands that will be affected by the Altamont alternative  
3 between the Bay -- between the Dumbarton crossing and the  
4 Central Valley. That is 27.4 acres. For your Pacheco  
5 alignment it is 290 acres. That is a factor of ten. It  
6 seems the numbers and the text in this draft document  
7 don't add up, and that is why a lot of people are  
8 frustrated.

PH-S014-4  
cont

9 Once again we needed high-speed rail ten years ago  
10 in this state. I would like to get home a little bit  
11 quicker than in 20 years than taking the Capitol when I  
12 leave here 5:46 or whenever this evening. Get this built.  
13 Get it built right. We only get one chance and it is a  
14 lot of money. Thank you again and thanks for you all  
15 staying around.

16 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. I  
17 really appreciate the specificity of your comments, and  
18 that gives our consultants an opportunity to really look  
19 at that.

20 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Is Tim Cremins here?

PH-S015

21 MR. CREMINS: I apologize. I thought I was  
22 passed up. Thank you.

23 I think you've heard most of the comments. We  
24 represent both members and public in the private sector.  
25 And we think, of course, for lack of a better term, this

PH-S015-1



1 is a wonderful thing. I think as airports become crowded  
2 modes of transportation, high-speed rail is definitely the  
3 answer. We believe we have gone through several EIRs and  
4 several different types of transportation projects. We  
5 believe it meets the threshold of what it is supposed to  
6 do and believe it will serve the state well.

7 Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.

9 Dan McNamara.

**PH-S016**

10 MR. MCNAMARA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

11 Dan McNamara from the Train Riders Association of  
12 California. TRAC has assembled a ten-member board of  
13 engineering people to review the EIR document, and I will  
14 just talk about the Central Valley alignment today.

15 On the Sacramento to Bakersfield alignment, after  
16 reading your documents, it looks like you have proved that  
17 the two alignments that you've looked at, the Burlington  
18 Northern Santa Fe and the UP alignment are infeasible.  
19 After reviewing everything, it looks like the capital  
20 costs went up 8- to \$10 billion. These two options use  
21 too much agricultural land. They damage the economic  
22 vitality of the whole Central Valley by tearing up the  
23 Central Valley, especially in particular the UP line.

24 The noise impacts, I think, are intolerable. You  
25 have trains running with a hundred DB noise on elevated

PH-S015-I  
cont

PH-S016-I

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

41

1 structures, trying to shoehorn it into the line. So all  
2 these little towns will get no service because we are only  
3 stopping this train a few times, but they get all the  
4 impact.

PH-S016-1  
cont

5 We can't understand the way the standards were  
6 built, the way it winds through the valley, at some point  
7 being 25 miles off of 99, so it seems funny that we are  
8 trying to squeeze it in and then we move away without --  
9 this isn't anything new. Your predecessor group, the  
10 California High-Speed Rail Commission in its 1996 report  
11 stated that the Burlington Northern Santa Fe line is 17  
12 percent longer than the new alignment, requires too much  
13 elevated structure. It, therefore, was infeasible. The  
14 UP alignment, because this alignment is close to densely  
15 populated areas, again a lot of elevated structures,  
16 tunnels and clearly disrupting the downtowns of the  
17 Central Valley, it was also proven not feasible.

18 Your consultant, Parsons Brinkerhoff Quad Douglas in  
19 its results in 1996 stated engineering issues and  
20 environmental impacts raised in the Central Valley  
21 alignment options largely stem from the relative proximity  
22 of it to urban areas. Construction costs are  
23 significantly higher and damage to the environment as it  
24 gets close to urban areas.

25 All is not lost here. I pinned it down to two

42

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 options that you had that you've proven aren't feasible.  
2 In the 1996 study the Parsons Brinkerhoff recommended an  
3 alignment called the West of 99 alignment. This alignment  
4 ran West of 99 and then had tracks going in and out of  
5 major cities so that 80 percent of the express trains,  
6 which is what this service is, is express, stay out of the  
7 urban areas of the town and just stop for the various  
8 cities. I really respected that study. It was done well.

9 As you know, your predecessor Ed Jordan, ex-Conrail  
10 CEO, I think was one of the smartest people I met in  
11 high-speed rail in California, and I think that is a lack  
12 of respect we don't put that option back and compare it to  
13 these two. At that point it was several billion dollars  
14 less. I will say it again, several billion dollars less.  
15 But it was removed. We have reviewed all of your  
16 documents. We can't see where there was a large  
17 discussion by the Authority removing this option. We  
18 think it would be very good to put it back into this  
19 study. We have searched all your documents again to try  
20 to find a negative comment made by your consultant,  
21 Parsons Brinkerhoff. We can't find any.

22 I think it would be very good, and this report would  
23 be incomplete, unless you put the West of 99 option back  
24 in.

25 Thank you.

PH-S016-I  
cont

**PH-S017**

PH-S017-1

1 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: David Underwood.

2 MR. UNDERWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
3 Board. I am David Underwood. I am the secretary of  
4 California Nevada Regional Conservation Committee, member  
5 of the National Transportation Issues Committee of the  
6 Sierra Club and also here for Transportation Involves  
7 Everyone.

8 We are quite concerned with your route selection.  
9 You have dismissed with just a cursory discussion the  
10 Altamont route. You have basically chosen the Pacheco  
11 Pass route which will create an urban sprawl in the Los  
12 Banos area. The Altamont route will actually cost less  
13 and add only ten minutes from L.A. to S.F., but would add  
14 at least a half hour from Sacramento to the Bay Area.

15 Merced would be better served by the Altamont route,  
16 for that matter. The route is going through Merced or  
17 close to it. Merced, for whatever reason, people in  
18 Merced seem to want a Diablo route. The Diablo route is a  
19 straw man argument. No one is going to build a tunnel  
20 through the Mt. Hamilton area. That route would go  
21 through the largest undeveloped area in the state. That  
22 is not tenable at all.

23 There is also other alternatives. But the  
24 high-speed users -- one, we are not opposed to high-speed  
25 rail. High-Speed rail uses one-tenth the amount of fuel

44

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 that an aircraft does to carry the same amount of  
2 passengers the same distance. And it's as efficient, if  
3 not more efficient, for distances up to 600 miles. The  
4 speed, the travel, the ease of travel, the access, and you  
5 do not have to have all the security measures that you  
6 have at airports. Unfortunately, the latest incident  
7 raises the issue somewhat. But as I said, the  
8 Merced-Sacramento-L.A. route would not be on the route at  
9 first build. So Sacramento to the Bay Area would not be  
10 part of your first route. So people in Sacramento would  
11 be waiting several years to get their route to the Bay  
12 Area, while the route goes through Los Banos. Routing Los  
13 Banos with a planned station at Los Banos makes one wonder  
14 why would one put a station in the middle of open farmland  
15 where there is nothing there unless somebody has some  
16 urban areas planned there for urban building, and the  
17 route continuing back through San Jose and north of  
18 Salinas in that area would have to go slower because it is  
19 projected to go through urban areas and could not travel  
20 the 200 mile an hour speed that it travels.

PH-S017-1  
cont

PH-S017-2

21 So we have several problems, and in particular the  
22 exclusion of the Altamont route and the cost differences.  
23 The Altamont route would be cheaper. So it needs to be  
24 included in the study and it needs to be studied quite  
25 thoroughly. Furthermore, the EIRs have not done any

PH-S017-3

1 studies on the these routes. What you are doing is saying  
2 we are going to choose the route and then do the studies  
3 later. That cannot go. That is not acceptable. You will  
4 have to do the studies on the routes first to show why  
5 these routes are acceptable or not acceptable before you  
6 adopt the route. Can't adopt the route first and then  
7 come out with EIR.

PH-S017-3  
cont

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Eddy Moore.

**PH-S018**<sup>10</sup>

MR MOORE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
11 Committee. Thank you for giving us an opportunity to  
12 speak. I am Eddy Moore, Planning and Conservation League.  
13 And I would like to associate myself with some of the  
14 remarks that have been made before, that we believe at  
15 this point, and we've taken a serious look at what we've  
16 been able to obtain and what is available so far, and we  
17 have retained expert staff to help us with that and we  
18 will continue in that effort throughout this process.

PH-S018-1

19 From what we have seen, despite the benefits that we  
20 want to see from high-speed rail, the Draft EIR is at this  
21 point, and we are concerned that it's fatally flawed in  
22 the omission of the kind of full and apples-to-apples  
23 comparison of Altamont with the other routes. That point  
24 has been made a number of times here. I could go into  
25 some of the specifics, but what I would really like to do

1 is move one step beyond that and say that we would like to  
2 work with the Authority and to find what are the  
3 parameters of looking at a side-by-side comparison that we  
4 think would satisfy a lot of people who around the state  
5 have become concerned about the project and maybe allow it  
6 thereby to move forward.

PH-S018-1

7 But I know that the Chair has asked for specifics  
8 earlier in the day and particularly written comments. We  
9 will submit very complete written comments. Let me give  
10 you an idea of some of the example issues.

11 The explication of the Sacramento ridership where my  
12 neighbors here in Sacramento have one option that would  
13 get them to San Francisco 50 minutes faster versus another  
14 one that is as slow as the current Capital train. Why  
15 leave the 50-minute faster version off the table and not  
16 even look at it. Our neighbors from Merced would be  
17 equally well-served. The argument of splitting the  
18 ridership three ways in the Bay area, I think that could  
19 be dealt with as we look at how Oakland is served. I  
20 think that there is a lot of discussion that could go on  
21 around the environmental impacts to the Bay. What we are  
22 hearing from other environmentalists is that that is an  
23 option that you should look into. There may be some  
24 synergy between the work that would be done to upgrade the  
25 Dumbarton crossing and other environmental projects going

47

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 on in the Bay now.

2 I think one thing we find a lack of in the existing  
3 Draft EIR is a lack of a very complete and clear  
4 side-by-side comparison of ridership to and from different  
5 cities under Altamont versus the routes being proposed by  
6 the Authority. And that is strategy of deferring the  
7 alignment decision until another level of environmental  
8 review, we think that in a sense you can't have it both  
9 ways, and say we will decide later what the route is, but  
10 this is not the main basis for that.

11 However, the Authority has, prior to EIR, eliminated  
12 major route decisions. I realize there is a whole panoply  
13 of route alignments that have been eliminated in the past.  
14 None of them stand out in the sense of being the preferred  
15 route of the High-Speed Rail Commission, which is the case  
16 with Altamont. In other words, they did look through a  
17 lot of routes. They came up with one that they took as  
18 the preferred route. We think it is unusual that the  
19 preferred route would not be one of the routes considered  
20 as we go forward.

21 Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much for  
23 your offer to work with us, help us in working out the  
24 EIR.

25 Mr. Gene Robinson.

PH-S018-1  
cont



**PH-S019**<sup>1</sup>

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. I am a retiree living in Elk Grove, City of Elk Grove, which is -- my residence, it is near the traction line which would be one of your proposed routes, at least for your Light Rail. My comment is more along your operational line rather than your EIR. I just wanted to share a couple of thoughts with you.

Not too long ago, about a year ago I guess, in Elk Grove we had a person drive around a crossing arm and get hit by a train there on the main boulevard in Elk Grove. And I would like to suggest to you that if you do go ahead and build your Light Rail -- your High-Speed train, that you try and develop some type of a cross-arm that would block the entire roadway as you get into the grade level crossing. I know your proposals are for high overhead types in the dense areas. But as you get out in these country crossings try and block the whole roadway so nobody can drive all the way around the thing and get hit.

One reason I especially mention this, my wife and I obviously are retired. We travel through Europe, and where they have these high-speed runs over in Germany, at least the time wait over there for an oncoming high-speed train is a long wait. And Americans are really going to be really impatient if you drop that arm, no train in sight anywhere, and you sit there and you sit there and

PH-S019-1

49

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 you wait and wait and wait, and finally "shw," the thing  
2 goes by. It is a different experience if people are not  
3 used to. And I think you are going to have to educate the  
4 public to this a little bit. I realize these are  
5 operational comments. But it is something that you should  
6 give some consideration to as you bring this experience to  
7 the public.

PH-S019-1

8 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. That  
9 is not simply operational; that is part of the overall  
10 design of the system and the need for grade separations in  
11 the construction.

12 Russell Reagan.

**PH-S020**

13 MR. REAGAN: Thank you. I just want to also  
14 concur with the some of what the earlier speakers said  
15 about the scope of EIR, that it's inadequate until the  
16 Altamont routing of the northern mountain crossing is  
17 considered. Also, something that they didn't point out  
18 which is that the problem with how the Bart system was  
19 planned and built was that it neglected the need for  
20 longer distance trains that could share the tracks if it  
21 was built as a track system that could accommodate  
22 different levels, different types of service, short and  
23 long distance. And likewise, this high-speed rail system  
24 should be planned as a system that could also accommodate  
25 that the infrastructure could be used also for shorter

PH-S020-1

1 distance trains, especially to serve the Bay Area markets  
2 to the north or to the Central Valley, San Joaquin,  
3 Modesto and Sacramento. And I have examined the arguments  
4 for why Altamont has not been included in this EIR. I  
5 think that the arguments are specious about too many  
6 branches to the line because most of the market passengers  
7 will be traveling point-to-point, all the way from their  
8 Northern California destination to their Southern  
9 California destination and having that many branches in  
10 the line really is not a problem operationally. So I  
11 strongly support expanding the scope of EIR to include  
12 Altamont.

PH-S020-1  
cont

13 Thank you.

**PH-S021**<sup>14</sup>

CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Paul Dorn.

15 MR. DORN: I will be very brief. Welcome to  
16 Sacramento. My name is Paul Dorn. I am the Executive  
17 Director of the California Bicycle Coalition. A lot of  
18 people have already made the case for high-speed rail.  
19 It's much needed. However, we have serious reservations  
20 about the lack of the Altamont Pass option being studied  
21 and would have a hard time supporting the high-speed rail  
22 if that option wasn't thoroughly examined.

PH-S021-1

23 Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

25 Barbara Washburn.

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

51

**PH-S022**<sup>1</sup>

2 MS. WASHBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
3 Board Members. My name is Barbara Washburn. I am an  
4 environmental toxicologist and a member of the Central  
5 California Traction Rail to Trails Conservancy and the  
6 Sheldon Community Association. The Rails to Trails  
7 Conservancy, I don't know if you are familiar with that  
8 organization, but it is a national organization and our  
9 local group is interested in promoting the Central Valley  
10 traction line as a hiking, biking and equestrian trail.

PH-S022-1

11 As you know, one of the alignments for the  
12 high-speed rail is right along the California traction  
13 line. In your EIR you have -- option A8 was identified as  
14 the preferred option because it had a low potential impact  
15 of county and cultural resources. I think this document  
16 has failed to consider the impact of that alignment on the  
17 small communities that are along the central California  
18 traction line. There are communities, Sheldon, Wilton and  
19 Harold, for example. These are old agricultural  
20 communities. There is still a lot of grazing land and  
21 some irrigated agriculture in the area. These communities  
22 were founded in the mid 1800s, and there is a real desire  
23 on part of the people in this part of the Sacramento  
24 County to maintain the agricultural lands and rural  
25 heritage. This is some of the few remaining areas within  
Sacramento County that is of this sort and has this

52

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 character. I think it would be a big mistake to align a  
2 high-speed rail which would literally go through the  
3 middle of many of these small communities.

4 Furthermore, with respect to biological resources,  
5 to put the train -- the train, to have it run through  
6 along the central California traction line would introduce  
7 a major transportation network in the area in which there  
8 is none, and, therefore, I believe would have some  
9 significant biological impacts that were addressed in the  
10 EIR. Seems to me that either the option along the Union  
11 Pacific or another corridor that's already established,  
12 that has major transportation activity there, would reduce  
13 the impacts to biological resources which there are  
14 significant biological resources which your document  
15 identifies them, of all -- of the whole line. Some of the  
16 most significant are on the Sacramento to Stockton route.

17 I would urge you to consider these as alternatives  
18 in your deliberations.

19 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much. That  
20 is a very good point.

21 Al Chaney. Mr. Al Chaney.

22 Alan Miller.

**PH-S023**<sup>23</sup>

23 MR. MILLER: Good evening. Earlier Mr. Diridon  
24 said that the written comments are what is important and  
25 not the repetitive spoken comments. He's probably tired

PH-S022-1  
cont

PH-S023-1

1 of hearing the word Altamont, Altamont, Altamont over and  
2 over again. Maybe there is reason for this. If I get on  
3 the Capital Corridor today, one hour and 43 minutes I will  
4 be in Emeryville. Mr. Storacoski [phonetic] intends to  
5 take ten minutes off that schedule; that is one hour and  
6 33 minutes to the end of rail where you then have to get  
7 on a bus to San Francisco.

8 According to the proposal in the 2000 business plan,  
9 one hour and 45 minutes by high-speed rail to get from  
10 here to downtown San Francisco. That doesn't make any  
11 sense. You may have forgotten that the legislators are  
12 here and they want to go to San Francisco and they want to  
13 go to San Francisco airport. And those are the people,  
14 the politicians who have a lot of influence as to what is  
15 going to happen with this project.

16 Speaking about politicians, in front of the Senate  
17 Transportation Committee on the 17th of February,  
18 Mr. Morshed stated that we asked the Germans, the French  
19 and the Japanese to review our work and that was in the  
20 business plan to concur with our decision to eliminate  
21 Altamont. Later stating it is in the environmental  
22 document. It was reviewed by French, the German and  
23 Japanese who all concurred on that.

24 I would like to see in the response to my statement  
25 here which Germans, which Japanese, which French. Because

PH-S023-1  
cont

1 I will tell you the large equipment manufacturers and the  
2 people who build high-speed rail in Europe do not think  
3 that it is sane to remove Altamont.

4 Also stated was in order to get to the San Francisco  
5 Bay Area, you to have to cross a range of hills and  
6 mountains there. So the question -- and there are no  
7 existing rail tracks and nothing in there. So the  
8 question is: How do you cross that area? This is not  
9 true. There are two existing rail rights-of-way, and  
10 they're over Altamont Pass. Also, the route studied --  
11 also, he stated that once you hit the Bay Area at Union  
12 City it requires that three-way split. It doubles your  
13 operating cost by coming through that area and it doesn't  
14 make financial sense.

15 However, nowhere in the EIR does it state that there  
16 will be a doubling of the operating cost, and I would like  
17 that statement justified. And also the three-way split  
18 only exists after the Phase II or Phase III extension to  
19 Oakland. And also, in Europe it is totally feasible to  
20 either have trains going to two different destinations or  
21 split the train. It is done all the time, and it's  
22 completely feasible.

23 I will say it again. Altamont.

24 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Mike Guerpette.

**PH-S024**<sup>25</sup>

MR. GUERPETTE: I would like to read a prepared

PH-S023-1  
cont

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

55

1 statement on behalf of the Central Valley Rails to Trails  
2 Foundation. The Central Valley Rails to Trails  
3 Foundation, or CVRTF, was formed in the year 2000 by local  
4 Sacramento County residents interested in preserving a  
5 27-mile Central California traction company railroad  
6 corridor as a trail for nonmotorized transportation.

PH-S024-1

7 This section of the corridor runs east of Highway 99  
8 from Elder Creek Road in Sacramento to Woodbridge Road in  
9 Lodi. The CCTC corridor is one of two rail corridors on  
10 the list of potential high-speed rail lines being proposed  
11 the California High-Speed Rail Authority for a bullet  
12 train. Variety of residential communities exist along the  
13 corridor, including the suburban developments north of  
14 Calvine Road and graduating from more rural areas of South  
15 Sacramento and north San Joaquin Counties. Developers and  
16 Realtors gave assurances to adjacent home buyers that the  
17 CCT tracks would be used for noncommercial -- would not be  
18 used for commercial or high-speed trains.

19 The use of the corridor for high-speed trains would  
20 cause local safety concerns. The corridor passes several  
21 schools, potentially subjecting the school children to  
22 dangers of high tension power lines and electromagnetic  
23 fields. The potential structure of rail for a bullet  
24 train would impact local quality of life. The conversion  
25 of the CCTC to a rail trail would help improve the air

56

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447



1 quality in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. The  
2 counties have experienced high air pollution levels and  
3 need to provide more opportunities for residents to leave  
4 their cars at home while commuting to work and traveling  
5 within the community.

PH-S024-1  
cont

6 Once the trail has been built, the CVRTF will  
7 continue to serve as a liaison to the communities along  
8 the trail, organizing volunteer patrols, cleanups, raising  
9 public and private dollars to help develop and maintain  
10 the community assets. CVRTF has gained support from the  
11 Cities of Elk Grove, Galt, Cosumnes, CPAC, South Gate  
12 Regional Park and District, Cosumnes River Indian  
13 Association, South County Horsemen's Association, Wilton  
14 Cosumnes Recreational Advisory Council, Sacramento Area  
15 Bicycle Association, Sacramento Wheelmen, Great Valley  
16 Center, and hundreds of other community leaders and  
17 businessmen and organizations.

18 Based on a survey of property owners within a  
19 thousand feet of the corridor, approximately 80 percent  
20 are in favor of the trail. Many owners note their  
21 opposition to a high-speed rail on the corridor resulting  
22 from its potential negative impact on the quality of life  
23 and value of their property. CVRTF is not opposed to  
24 high-speed rail trains and understands that rails and  
25 trails can coexist. However, since the CCTC has not been

57

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 used for several years, the foundation is concerned about  
2 traumatic impact that would likely be caused by an active  
3 rail line. This is especially of concern for current and  
4 perspective home buyers whose property value border the  
5 corridor. The CVRTF recommends the use of the other  
6 Sacramento Stockton corridor due to its existing lines.  
7 Its neighbors, property owners and residence are  
8 accustomed to the use.

PH-S024-1  
cont

9 Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you.

11 Steve Martinez.

**PH-S025**

12 MR. MARTINEZ: Thank you. This is my son  
13 Daniel. That is my daughter Amanda. We are all opposed  
14 to using this CCTC corridor. It literally runs right  
15 behind my house. And that is why we are here this  
16 evening.

PH-S025-1

17 Please don't use that route. There are other routes  
18 that are functional. It is literally right behind my  
19 fence.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

22 And that is the comments that I have today unless  
23 someone else wants to.

24 Thank you, everyone, for coming here. I think you  
25 can see the difficulty in front of us, the disagreements

58

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

1 as to routes and other issues that we have as Members of  
2 the Board and through the analysis of the Environmental  
3 Impact Report make some sense of and resolve. These  
4 issues exist everywhere in a project like this. We  
5 promise you we will do the best we can.

6 Thank you very much.

7 We noticed this till 8:00. We have finished at a  
8 quarter after five. We will have someone here to take  
9 whatever comments there are between now and 8:00.

10 (Break in testimony taken.)

**PH-S026**

11 MR. CHAMPION: I am here as a citizen, although  
12 I work for state government. My name is Ken Champion.  
13 And what my comment is, entails the map for the route of  
14 the high-speed rail train. I would hope that at some  
15 point the developers could entertain the idea of having a  
16 segment of the overall system go from Bakersfield through  
17 the El Cajon Pass of the Tehachapi Mountain range into the  
18 large city of San Bernardino as an ultimate destination,  
19 in addition to the other segments that now go to Los  
20 Angeles, the south part of California.

21 I would also hope that the time period for  
22 development of the corridor land would not be too long in  
23 coming on a Phase I type of development approach, because  
24 it is my understanding that California's population is  
25 growing at the right of one-half million new people each

PH-S026-1

1 year and land transformation is occurring at a rapid pace.  
2 Preservation of the high-speed rail corridor is,  
3 therefore, an imperative to be done in a lead time project  
4 basis, so that competing local land use does not become an  
5 obstruction to the high-speed corridor development.

PH-S026-1  
cont

6 Thank you for taking my comments.

7 (Break taken in testimony.)

8 MR. CHAMPION: Ken Champion, further comments.

9 The train corridor should be quite wide, if possible, to  
10 allow for a twin technology type of train system. The  
11 near term train system for the Shenkinsan train system and  
12 the TGV system would be on one side of the corridor.  
13 Midway across the width of the corridor would be a  
14 separator and on the other side of the corridor would be  
15 vacant land used for a future magnetic levitation train  
16 system, or if that technology does not prove to be viable  
17 further expansion of the TGV and Shenkinsan type trains so  
18 that more frequent train trips could be made, with  
19 multiple ends of the line destinations such as between San  
20 Francisco and Los Angeles, between Sacramento and Los  
21 Angeles, and perhaps between San Bernardino and San  
22 Francisco or San Bernardino and Sacramento, so a wider  
23 train corridor should be examined.

PH-S026-2

24 The future growth of California is anticipated to  
25 have a huge population. The more mobility options we can

1 build into the train corridor system today, the less  
2 costly it will be tomorrow.

3 The power source for the train system should look at  
4 multiple electrical sources, including nuclear powerplants  
5 placed in safe uninhabited areas, since these are being

6 used in Japan and Europe in a safe manner. And the  
7 nuclear technology for naval ships, that ride the ocean  
8 and go through rough ocean weather and a lot of vibration  
9 and movement, have stood the test of proving itself.

10 Future mobility for California will be very important with  
11 this dedicated and separate passenger train system because  
12 it will remove passenger trains from being interspersed  
13 with freight trains. Freight trains of the future will  
14 also have increased tonnage, freight loads that they will  
15 have to serve because of the huge population that  
16 California will have. That's all I have to say.

17 There is one further thing I have to say regarding  
18 train stations up and down the corridor of California. I  
19 would ask that it be very seriously considered that these  
20 stations be multi-modal transportation complexes, that  
21 interfaces with bus lines such as Greyhound and regional  
22 bus lines such as Yolo bus, Roseville Transit, El Dorado  
23 Transit, and those regional lines serving other cities  
24 such as Fresno, Bakersfield, Los Angeles, San Francisco,  
25 for the convenience of riders, and that through ticketing

PH-S026-2  
cont

PH-S026-3

PH-S026-4

1 that allows an accountancy firm to partition the fares of  
2 a person by mileage when they ride a bus or when they  
3 tried the train or when they rent a car at the end of the  
4 trip.

PH-S026-4  
cont

5 So that by using different modes and through  
6 ticketing, everything could be arranged in advance, if  
7 feasible. Door-to-door service, using the rental car  
8 agencies placed in the multi-modal station complex could  
9 make it convenient to transfer luggage and to walk from  
10 place to place without having to endure long distances.  
11 The rail yards in Sacramento could be an example of a  
12 multi-modal transportation center that would be an end  
13 station for the high-speed rail where it could come into  
14 town, and people could see the political center of  
15 California and a lot of tourist attractions, as well as  
16 the Metropolitan Convention Center and other types of  
17 places to go. Light Rail systems, bus systems, high-speed  
18 rail systems and rental car systems should all be  
19 interfaced at these multi-modal complexes. This could be  
20 a template for the future.

21 Thank you.

22 (Break in testimony.)

**PH-S027**<sup>23</sup>

MS. SERMERSHEIM: I am Kristi Sermersheim. I  
24 am a from San Jose, California. I think this would be  
25 great. I think the choice between the San Jose and Gilroy

PH-S027-1

1 route is clear. This train should go to San Jose. We  
2 should leave Gilroy to garlic and the outlets, and San  
3 Jose is the city that ought to have a train station. I  
4 have been in Japan. They are wonderful. Let's get one in  
5 California. I'll pay for the bond -- I mean I will vote  
6 yes. I won't pay the whole thing.

PH-S027-1  
cont

7 Thanks.

8 (Public hearing concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

9 ---oOo---

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PH-S027-2

## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2  
3  
4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
5 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO ) ss.

6  
7  
8 I, ESTHER F. SCHWARTZ, certify that I was the  
9 official Court Reporter for the proceedings named herein,  
10 and that as such reporter, I reported in verbatim  
11 shorthand writing those proceedings;

12 That I thereafter caused my shorthand writing to be  
13 reduced to printed format, and the pages numbered 3  
14 through 63 herein constitute a complete, true and correct  
15 record of the proceedings.

16  
17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this  
18 certificate at Sacramento, California, on this 28th day of  
19 March, 2004.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 ESTHER F. SCHWARTZ  
CSR NO. 1564

CAPITOL REPORTERS (916) 923-5447

64